UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,609	08/31/2000	Gregory L. Slaughter	5181-70000	4143

7590 01/19/2006

Robert C Kowert
Conley Rose & Tayon PC
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER	
ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2131	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/653,609	SLAUGHTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kaveh Abrishamkar	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-68* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-68* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication received on November 2, 2005. Claims 1-68 are being considered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pages 2-3, filed November 2, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-68 under Slaughter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976) in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,760,306) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Slaughter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976) in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,7775,701).

Double Patenting

3. Claims 1-68 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-104 of U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701). Claim 1-104 of the 6,917,976 patent disclose the same method as the claims in the present application. The 6,917,976 patent discloses receiving a request from a client to a service in a data representation language (e.g. XML) referencing a resource, and specifies a first

requested lease period, which is then granted by the service. This lease can be renewed, or cancelled by the client by sending a lease renewal or cancellation message to the service. The application and the patent claim these features in an identical manner. The obviousness type rejection is used for the new limitations of the client obtaining a credential and using that credential in the service request message for authentication to reserve the resource. This obviousness-type double patenting rejection is given below.

4. Claims 1,25, 37, 45, 54, and 61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701). Claim 1 of 6,917,976 discloses all the limitations of pending claim 1 including sending a service request message in a data representation language referencing a resource and specifies a first requested lease period, and said service granting access to said resource. The claims only differ in the limitations of the "client obtaining a credential for allowing said client to lease access to a resource provided by a service" and "including the credential in a specified lease period" and "examining said credential included in said service request message to determine if the credential is authentic" and "granting or not granting access depending on if the credential is authentic or not authentic." Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701) teaches the above limitations. Pan teaches a system to test the overall validity of a service reservation (column 2 line 63 – column 3 line 17). The authentication is performed by using the credential present in the resource request

(column 2 line 63 – column 3 line 17), and based on the comparison of the credential in the authentication server, a determination is made of whether or not to grant access to the resource (column 3 lines 27-34). Using credentials is well-known in the art to provide authentication and repudiation of users. Pan states that the use of credentials would "govern who on network 10 can request a service (called "authorization") and the maximum amount of network services available to a requestor (column 3 lines 41-50). In the system of Slaughter (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976), it would have been obvious to use a credential to insure that the user that is requesting network resources is authorized to do reserve such resources.

5. Claims 2,28, 38, 47, 57, and 62 are rejected by claim 2 of the U.S. 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).
Claim 2 of the 6,917,976 teaches "sending a service request response message in said data representation language advising said client of said first granted lease period, wherein said service response message includes said credential. The combination of Pan to add a credential to the system of U.S. 6,917,976 was given above in rejecting claim 1, and claims 2,28,38,47, 57, and 62 are rejected following the same reasoning.

6. Claims 3, 4,31,49,and 64 are rejected by claim 4 of the U.S. 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 4 is identical to the claims listed above except for the limitation "examining said credential." This credential is disclosed by Pan, and the statement for the reasoning of combination is given above in rejecting claims 1,25, 37, 45, 54, and 61.

7. Claim 5-7, 29,39, and 46 are rejected by claim 1 of the U.S. 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,75,701).

Claim 1 teaches the step of "the client receiving the service response message" but does no teach the step of "examining the credential." Pan teaches this step, and the statement for the reasoning of combination is given above in rejecting claims 1,25, 37, 45, 54, and 61.

8. Claims 8-12, 32-33, 40-41, 50, 55-56, and 65 are rejected by claim 5 of the U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 5 (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976) is identical to the above claims in that it discloses the sending a "lease renewal message referencing said resource." However, the 6,917,976 reference does not disclose examining, authenticating, and granting access if the credential is valid. However, Pan teaches sending a credential with each request for resources (column 2 line 63 – column 3 line 17). Using credentials is well-known in the art to provide authentication and repudiation of users. Pan states that the use of credentials would "govern who on network 10 can request a service (called "authorization") and the maximum amount of network services available to a requestor

(column 3 lines 41-50). In the system of Slaughter (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976), it would have been obvious to use a credential to insure that the user that is requesting network resources is authorized to do reserve such resources.

8. Claims 13-14, 21,34,42,51,58, and 66 are rejected by claim 6 of the U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 6 (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976) is identical to the above claims in that it discloses "sending a lease cancel message in a data representation language," "said service receiving said lease cancel message" and "terminating the first granted lease period." However, the 6,917,976 patent does not teach the lease message including the credential and authenticating the credential. However, Pan teaches sending a credential with each request for resources (column 2 line 63 – column 3 line 17). Using credentials is well-known in the art to provide authentication and repudiation of users. Pan states that the use of credentials would "govern who on network 10 can request a service (called "authorization") and the maximum amount of network services available to a requestor (column 3 lines 41-50). In the system of Slaughter (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976), it would have been obvious to use a credential to insure that the user that is requesting network resources is authorized to do reserve such resources.

9. Claim 15 is rejected by claim 8 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 15 is identical to claim 8 of the U.S. Patent 6,917,976).

10. Claim 16 is rejected by claim 21 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 16 is identical to claim 21 of the U.S. Patent 6,917,976).

11. Claim 17 is rejected by claim 22 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 17 is identical to claim 22 of the U.S. Patent 6,917,976).

12. Claims 18, 35, 52, and 67 are rejected by claim 22-23 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claims 22-23 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 have all the identical limitations of claim 18,35,52, and 67.

13. Claims 19,and 26 are rejected by claim 1 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 19 provides the additional steps of obtaining a credential including "client sending to an authentication service information identifying the client" and "client receiving the credential." Pan discloses a "network resource manager" which is used to validate the user credentials (column 3 lines 27-33). This network resource manager provides the user credentials to the users so that it can compare the credential information when a resource is requested. Pan states that the use of credentials would "govern who on network 10 can request a service (called "authorization") and the maximum amount of network services available to a requestor (column 3 lines 41-50). In the system of Slaughter (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976), it would have been obvious to use a credential to insure that the user that is requesting network resources is authorized to do reserve such resources.

14. Claims 20, and 27 are rejected by claim 1 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 20 recites the additional limitations not claim in claim 1 of 6,917,976 concerned with examining the credential including "sending to said authentication service said credential included in said service request message" and "receiving from the authentication service indication if the credential is authentic." Pan discloses a "network resource manager" which is used to validate the user credentials (column 3 lines 27-33). This network resource manager provides the user credentials to the users so that it can compare the credential information when a resource is requested. Pan states that

the use of credentials would "govern who on network 10 can request a service (called "authorization") and the maximum amount of network services available to a requestor (column 3 lines 41-50). In the system of Slaughter (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976), it would have been obvious to use a credential to insure that the user that is requesting network resources is authorized to do reserve such resources.

15. Claims 22, 30, 43, and 59 are rejected by claim 3 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claims 22,30,43, and 59 are identical to claim 3 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in that claim 3 comprises all the limitations of claim 3.

16. Claims 23,36,44,53, 60 and 68 are rejected by claim 24 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 24 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 is identical to the claims 23,36,44,53,60, and 68 in that all claims state wherein "said data representation language is eXtensible Markup Language (XML).

17. Claim 24 is rejected by claim 25 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 25 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 is identical to claim 24 of the application in that both disclose "wherein said first granted lease period is less than or equal to said first requested lease period."

18. Claims 48 and 63 are rejected by claim 3 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 in view of Pan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,701).

Claim 3 of U.S. Patent 6,917,976 is identical to the claims 48 and 63 of the present application as both disclose "a space service process", "a plurality of service advertisements for enabling access by client devices to resources," and "wherein said space service obtains said first granted lease period from said service on behalf of the client." The claim 3 does not teach "examining said credential by the space device." Pan discloses a "network resource manager" which is used to validate the user credentials (column 3 lines 27-33). This network resource manager provides the user credentials to the users so that it can compare the credential information when a resource is requested. Using credentials is well-known in the art to provide authentication and repudiation of users. Pan states that the use of credentials would "govern who on network 10 can request a service (called "authorization") and the maximum amount of network services available to a requestor (column 3 lines 41-50). In the system of Slaughter (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,976), it would have been obvious to use a credential to insure that the user that is requesting network resources is authorized to do reserve such resources.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 571-272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KA
01/12/2006

Primary Examiner
AU 2131
1/13/06